

The IEA program is offered through the Greater Greensboro Builders Association and Guilford Technical Community College. Assistance is also provided nationally by the Home Builders Institute, the educational arm of the National Association of Home Builders, and PAVE, the Educational and Training Foundation.

The only goal of the program is to help train these dislocated adults, turning them into skilled carpentry framers and place them in jobs in the building industry. By providing the students with quality classroom instruction and hands-on training at the work site from professionals in the home building industry, the IEA program helps students prepare for work in the homebuilding industry. In fact, 100 percent of the students completing the program have been placed in jobs in the homebuilding industry.

As we look for successful models in which to prepare young Americans for industries of the future, I urge everyone to examine the IEA program in Greensboro. It is an excellent example of the private sector (home builders) and the public sector (local schools) working in partnership in order to prepare students for quality careers in the building industry. On behalf of the citizens of the Sixth District of North Carolina, we congratulate IEA for a job well done.

#### AGRICULTURE AND THE GATT

HON. JILL L. LONG

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 7, 1994

Ms. LONG. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, a number of House Members and I, including Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. EMERSON, and Mr. BEREUTER, introduced legislation to ensure that agriculture did not pay a disproportionate share of the implementing cost of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. In fact, the legislation was cosponsored by over 55 Members of the House of Representatives—including a large majority of members of the Committee on Agriculture. Similar legislation was also introduced in the Senate by Senator DASCHLE, Senator PRYOR, Senator COCHRAN, Senator CONRAD, and others. In fact, every member of the Senate Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry Committee—except one—cosponsored the legislation.

Since that time, Mr. Speaker, the Clinton administration has earnestly worked with concerned Members to ensure that American agriculture will reap all of the benefits of this important trade agreement. In this regard, Chief of Staff Panetta, Ambassador Kantor, Secretary Espy, and Acting OMB Director Rivlin have been most helpful.

As a result of this cooperative effort, most of the Members, along with a large number of agriculture organizations, who had some concerns about GATT and agriculture are now enthusiastically supportive of the implementing legislation.

I am inserting into the RECORD some additional material that further explains the assurances that were given by the administration, in addition to some other pertinent documentation. I do so for the benefit of my colleagues and all others who are interested.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, DC., September 30, 1994.

HON. E (KIKI) DE LA GARZA,  
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The GATT implementing legislation now before Congress is one of the most important measures for the U.S. economy and global economies that we have had the opportunity to enact in recent years. It is the result of many years of bipartisan efforts, and is particularly important for our agricultural sector. Our projections are that it will lead to increased U.S. agricultural exports of \$5-14 billion cumulatively over the next five years and the creation of 112,000 export-related U.S. jobs.

My Administration is also prepared to take further steps to support the agricultural sector as this legislation is being implemented. These steps are detailed in a letter to you from Secretary Espy and Acting Director Rivlin, and I would like to emphasize my support for them.

My Administration will refocus the Export Enhancement Program and the Dairy Export Incentive Program so they can be used for market expansion in addition to focusing on combating unfair trade practices. We will also propose increases over the next five years in the level of USDA "greenbox" and other programs that are not constrained by GATT.

On the domestic front, I want to assure you that I am strongly supportive of USDA's Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) and am committed to ensuring that it will continue. Finally, as described in the Espy-Rivlin letter, my next two budget requests will safeguard spending for agricultural programs.

I hope this helps to clarify my Administration's support for agriculture programs, and that I can count on your support in passing the GATT legislation and working to realize its benefits for American farmers and the entire U.S. agricultural sector.

With best wishes,  
Sincerely,

BILL.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY  
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE  
PRESIDENT  
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,  
September 30, 1994.

HON. E (KIKI) DE LA GARZA,  
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enactment of GATT is vital to the continuing economic expansion of the U.S., and particularly for expanding opportunities in the agricultural sector. Our estimates are that the implementation of the GATT agreement will lead to a cumulative increase of U.S. agricultural exports over the next five years of between \$5 and \$14 billion. These increased agricultural exports will result in a gain of 112,000 U.S. jobs by 2000.

In spite of these significant benefits, however, we know there remain concerns in some quarters about the effects of projected reductions in federal spending on agriculture-related programs resulting from GATT's implementation. Therefore, we are making commitments in some additional areas that will reassure and further benefit the agricultural sector.

The Administration has decided, as part of the implementation of GATT, to refocus USDA's Export Enhancement Program (EEP) and Dairy Export Incentive Program (DEIP) so they can be used for market expansion and promotion, not just for combating unfair trade practices as is currently the

case. The GATT implementing legislation we submitted to Congress on September 27th will effect this change in the EEP program, based on the language suggested by the Agriculture Committees in their draft GATT legislation. A parallel change to the DEIP program will be made administratively.

We also want to reiterate the Administration's commitment to use these and other export programs, as well as the Sunflower and Cotton Oilseed Assistance Programs, to the maximum levels allowed under GATT and U.S. law. Throughout the six-year GATT implementing period, we intend to request that Congress make available funds for these programs to the fullest extent permissible under GATT.

In addition, we will work with others in the Administration to develop and utilize an expedited interagency review process to ensure that sales under the EEP and DEIP programs are carried out promptly in a market-sensitive manner that fulfills the broader program focus described above.

The Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) has been another priority for the agricultural community. The Administration strongly supports the CRP program and will act to ensure its continuation. We have already taken action to extend our baseline CRP funding, in the Midsession Review of the President's FY 1995 Budget. In addition, USDA has announced that CRP participants with contracts that expire in 1995 can modify and extend their contracts for an additional year. The Administration will include a full continuation of the CRP in the FY 1996 Budget baseline, and will propose reauthorization and extension of the CRP in 1995.

The Administration also wishes to reassure the Committee that it is planning to maintain total discretionary spending on USDA agricultural programs at or above the FY 1995 level in the FY 1996 and 1997 Budget requests to Congress. In formulating future budgets, we will take into consideration reductions made in agriculture budgets in the past and during the GATT round.

To broadly support market development for agricultural products, the Administration will propose increases in "greenbox" and other GATT-allowed agricultural program levels by \$600 million over the next 5 years. These programs will include a combination of direct spending, direct credits, and credit guarantees. Consistent with the draft GATT legislation prepared by the Agriculture Committees, this effort will include funding for the Market Promotion Program and other programs to benefit a wide range of commodities, including dairy, oilseed products, and high-value commodity products. In addition, funding will be included to support development of alternative uses for agricultural products.

One source of offsets to fund this increase this year of crop insurance reform. To the extent that those savings are not sufficient to fund this increased program level, funding for such agriculture programs will be proposed as additional agricultural spending in future budgets.

We appreciate your continued support and look forward to working closely with you on agricultural issues in the future.

Sincerely,

MIKE ESPY,  
Secretary of Agriculture.  
ALICE M. RIVLIN,  
Acting Director.

October 5, 1994.

HON. JILL LONG,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE LONG: On behalf of the organizations listed below, we would like to take this opportunity to express our strong support for Congressional passage

this year of legislation implementing the Uruguay Round General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT).

The economic well-being of U.S. agriculture is heavily dependent on its ability to compete in the international marketplace. This is underscored by the fact that agricultural exports account for nearly one-third of U.S. production and provide employment for nearly one million Americans.

It is anticipated that the Uruguay Round agreement on GATT will provide even greater trade opportunities for U.S. agriculture. According to recent estimates, U.S. agricultural exports are projected to increase by \$5 to \$14 billion over the next 5 years which, in turn, would create an additional 112,000 new jobs.

To realize this potential, however, will depend on the extent that U.S. agricultural policies and programs continue to be equally competitive with those of other countries, especially the European Union. Clearly, as history has shown, our foreign competitors will continue to use every available weapon allowed under GATT to maintain and expand their share of the world market. Without a similar commitment, U.S. agriculture will be at a significant disadvantage.

This is why we strongly supported legislation (H.R. 4675) which you introduced and which was unanimously adopted by the House Committee on Agriculture as part of its recommendations on GATT.

The Administration, consistent with H.R. 4675, has pledged its support for maintaining U.S. agricultural policies and programs, including funding, at the maximum levels allowed under GATT; announced its commitment to provide \$600 million in additional funding for certain other GATT-allowable or "green box" programs such as market development and promotion, export credit, food assistance (P.L. 480 and TEFAP), as well as for developing alternative uses from agricultural commodities; and emphasized it will maintain and extend the conservation reserve program (CRP).

These actions will help U.S. agriculture remain viable and competitive in the international marketplace; meet the food and fiber needs of consumers at home and abroad; contribute to continued economic growth, jobs and an expanding tax base; and help fully capitalize on the potential market opportunities expected to result from the Uruguay Round agreement on GATT.

For these reasons, we want to take this opportunity to express our strong support of the Uruguay Round implementing legislation and to urge that such legislation be approved by Congress this year.

At the same time, we want to express our appreciation to you for your continued strong leadership on behalf of agriculture and rural America.

Sincerely,

American Farm Bureau Federation; American Forest and Paper Association; American Meat Institute; Coalition for Food Aid; International Apple Institute; National Association of State Departments of Agriculture; National Barley Growers Association; National Cattlemen's Association; National Corn Growers Association; National Cotton Council; National Council of Farmer Cooperatives; National Pork Producers Council; National Potato Council; United Egg Association; United Egg Producers; United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association; and USA Rice Federation.

## MOVING BEYOND THE STATUS QUO: THE NEED FOR A BOLD NUCLEAR POLICY

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 7, 1994

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, the world has changed dramatically and I had hoped for a bold change in policy governing our nuclear forces. We have instead courageously committed ourselves to stay the course, polish our missiles, and wrap up a few loose ends.

For the benefit of my colleagues I would like to include in the RECORD an analysis of this policy change prepared by the Union of Concerned Scientists. The opportunity to win the peace is at hand and we should be actively negotiating further nuclear reductions.

### CLINTON'S STATUS QUO NUCLEAR POLICY

(by Jennifer Weeks)

With the release of the Nuclear Posture Review [NPR] and the conclusion of the September 27-28 Washington summit, the Clinton Administration confirmed that its nuclear weapons policy is basically treading water. Although Russian President Boris Yeltsin has proposed additional nuclear cuts, the U.S. seems determined to ignore this opportunity.

Announcing that the administration would undertake the NPR in October 1993, then-Defense Secretary Les Aspin promised a "fundamental" reexamination of nuclear weapons policy, doctrine, force structure, and arms control issues. However, a year later, the final product called only for a few cosmetic changes to the nuclear forces inherited from the Bush Administration—retiring four nuclear submarines and 26 B-52 bombers—while retaining the 3,500 warheads allowed under the START II treaty. The NPR rejected adopting a policy of no first use of nuclear weapons.

Clinton Administration officials justified the decision not to seek nuclear reductions below START II levels as a precaution against a possible political reversal in Russia, which is drawing down its arsenal more slowly than the U.S. due to political and economic constraints. In Defense Secretary William Perry's words, "the small but real danger that reform in Russia might fail and a new government arise hostile to the United States, still armed with 25,000 nuclear weapons requires us to maintain a nuclear hedge."

Days after the NPR was unveiled, Russian President Boris Yeltsin presented a fundamentally different perspective in an address to the U.N. General Assembly. Speaking hours after President Clinton, Yeltsin indicated that Russia is prepared to reduce the role of nuclear weapons in its security policy. Yeltsin proposed negotiating a treaty among the five nuclear weapons states that would provide, among other things, for "further elimination of nuclear munitions and reduction of strategic carriers." He also called for strengthening security assurance to non-nuclear weapons states, in order to build support for extension of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty [NPT] in 1995.

However, the joint statement issued by Clinton and Yeltsin at the conclusion of their Washington summit expressed only a remote possibility of timely progress on further cuts:

"The Presidents instructed their experts to intensify their dialogue to compare conceptual approaches and to develop concrete steps to adapt the nuclear forces and prac-

tices on both sides to the changed international security situation and to the current spirit of U.S.-Russian partnership, including the possibility, after ratification of START II, of further reductions of, and limitations on, remaining nuclear forces."

Not only did the U.S. pass up a potential opportunity to achieve further Russian nuclear reductions; in addition, this highly qualified pledge is unlikely to satisfy growing international pressure for the nuclear powers to fulfill their obligation under Article VI of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty [NPT] to move toward nuclear disarmament. In mid-September, at a preparatory meeting for the April 1995 conference that will consider whether to extend the NPT, the non-aligned states announced that their support for the NPT will depend on "substantive progress" in a number of areas—including statements from the U.S. and Russia on how they will reduce their nuclear arsenals below START II levels.

Clinton and Yeltsin did agree to two significant actions at their September meeting. First, the U.S. and Russia will speed implementation of START II by deactivating weapons that are to be reduced under that treaty as soon as it is ratified, rather than over a period of years as specified in the treaty. This accelerated schedule could make it possible to implement START II more quickly, paving the way for additional reductions.

Second, at a meeting scheduled for December of this year, Vice President Gore and Russian Prime Minister Chernomyrdin will exchange data on aggregate stockpiles of nuclear warheads and fissile materials and on their safety and security. However, this step falls short of what is needed. The U.S. and Russia will ultimately have to exchange complete information on their nuclear inventories—including the sizes and locations of stockpiles and storage sites, and descriptions of various weapon facilities—to make this data useful for defense and arms control planning, and to prevent either side from setting aside a secret cache of nuclear weapons or materials.

To make nuclear reductions permanent and irreversible, Clinton and Yeltsin will have to take a number of further steps, including:

Reciprocal monitoring: Joint monitoring of sites in each country where weapons are dismantled and where components and weapon-usable fissile materials are stored would increase security at Russian nuclear sites and build confidence that both sides are reducing their arsenals on schedule.

No weapon "recycling": In his U.N. speech, Yeltsin called for an agreement among the five nuclear powers to bar using fissile materials from dismantled warheads in new weapons. If the U.S. and Russia agreed to dismantle all of the warheads they will remove from service under START I and II and to put the fissile materials under international safeguards, they would not be able to keep large reserve stockpiles of nuclear warheads (as both countries are currently expected to do).

Deeper cuts: The most effective way to reduce future nuclear threats is to lock in substantial nuclear reductions now. If the Clinton Administration is worried about a resurgent Russia—as the Nuclear Posture Review recommendations indicate—then it should do everything possible in the short term to bring Russia's nuclear weapons under control.

Hardliners in both the U.S. and the Russian governments oppose the types of steps outlined above, and likely were a major factor in the cautious tone of the September summit. Ironically, it is Yeltsin who seems most willing to oppose those voices against change; in his U.N. speech he stated, "We